

BURNS DOANEBURNS DOANE SWECKER & MATHIS LLP
ATTORNEYS AT LAWALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA
REDWOOD SHORES, CALIFORNIA
DURHAM, NORTH CAROLINA**REPLY TO:**
P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404**TELEPHONE:** +1.703.836.6620**FACSIMILE:** +1.703.836.2021 (Group 3)
+1.703.836.0028 (Group 4)**DATE:** January 2, 2004

RECIPIENT INFORMATION	SENDER INFORMATION
To: Michele M. Kidwell	From: Jennifer Topmiller
Voice Tel. No.: 703-305-2941	Voice Tel. No.: 703-838-6505
Fax Tel. No.: 703-746-3383	Sent By: Janice Fulmer
Your Ref.: U.S. Application No. 09/194,700	Our Ref.: 000515-141
	Total Pages (Incl. Cover Page): 3

RE: U.S. Patent Application No. 09/194,700 - Urban WIDLUND**MESSAGE:**

Examiner Kidwell:

Per your request in our telephone conversation earlier this week, attached is an Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form in anticipation of our telephonic interview scheduled for **Tuesday, January 6, 2004 at 10 am.**

I look forward to speaking with you. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Topmiller

NOTE: The information contained in this facsimile message is attorney-client privileged and contains confidential information intended only for the use of the person(s) named above and others expressly authorized to receive it. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this message is prohibited and you are asked to notify us immediately by telephone and to return this message to us by mail without copying it.

Any questions regarding compatibility should be directed to our Office Services Department at + 1.703.836.6620.

APPLICANT INITIATED INTERVIEW REQUEST FORM

Application No.: 09/194,700 First Named Applicant: Urban Widlund
Attorney's Dkt. No.: 000515-141 Examiner: Michele M. Kidwell
Group Art Unit: 3761 Status of Application: Final rejection
Tentative Participants: (1) Jennifer Topmiller (2) Examiner Kidwell
(3) (4)
Proposed Date of Interview: 1/6/04 Proposed Time: 10:00 X AM
Type of Interview Requested: (1) ☒ Telephonic (2) Personal (3) Video Conference
Exhibit To Be Shown Or Demonstrated: Yes ☒ No
If yes, provide brief description:

ISSUES TO BE DISCUSSED

Issues (Rej., Obj., etc.)	Claims/ Fig. #s	Cited Documents	Discussed	Agreed	Not Agreed
(1) New Matter			[]	[]	[]
(2) 112 (enablement)	27-30		[]	[]	[]
(3) 102/103	all	Miller et al., Blen et al.	[]	[]	[]
(4)			[]	[]	[]
[] Continuation Sheet Attached					

Brief Description of Arguments to be Presented:

Concerning new matter, support for Claims 27-30 can be found, at least, on p. 13, ll. 21-36.
Concerning enablement, above-cited support is enabling. Moreover, (continued on 2nd page)

An interview was conducted on the above-identified application on _____.

NOTE: This form should be completed by applicant and submitted to the examiner in advance of the interview (see MPEP § 713.01). This application will not be delayed from issue because of applicant's failure to submit a written record of this interview. Therefore, applicant is advised to file a statement of the substance of this interview (37 C.F.R. § 1.133(b)) as soon as possible.

Jennifer Topmiller
Applicant's / Applicants' Representative Signature
Reg. No. 50,435

Examiner / SPE Signature

SEND TO:
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Brief Description of Arguments to be Presented (continued):

no reasoning was provided in the current Office Action to support a conclusion of non-enablement. M.P.E.P. § 2164.04 states that specific technical reasons must be supplied.

Concerning the 102/103 rejections over Miller et al. and Bien et al., Applicants intend to discuss that Miller et al. **never** mention the use of **hydrophilic** material, much less in the particular orientation described in the present claims. Rather, all that Miller et al. disclose is the use of water-permeable, **hydrophobic** material as a cover sheet with the periphery rendered water-impermeable in order to prevent leakage. The Examiner argues that because Miller discloses a blend of acrylic and rayon and rayon is allegedly hydrophilic that Miller et al. are disclosing the use of a hydrophilic cover sheet.

Moreover, Miller et al. state that the coversheet has a hydrophobic character so even if there was support for the proposition that generally rayon is hydrophilic, it is negated by Miller et al.'s characterization of the properties of the cover sheet - that is, that the coversheet is hydrophobic. Given the fact that Miller et al. propose the use of a hydrophobic coversheet, there is no motivation to modify this teaching to arrive at the presently claimed invention. The disclosure of Bien et al. does not remedy this deficiency.

SEND TO:
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450